

TEN MINUTES ADMONITION,

IN ANSWER TO

TEN MINUTES CAUTION,

FROM

A Plain Man to his Fellow Citizens.

BY A

SHEFFIELD RAZOR MAKER.

SHEFFIELD:

PRINTED BY JOSEPH GALES,

And sold by him and all other Bookfellers.

1792.

[Price ~~Four~~ pence.]

Price

13

NOTICE OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

Ten Minutes Admonition, &c.

I Have frequently heard and read of the extreme and disgraceful state of ignorance in which the Bulk of the People are said to be in this country, even at this enlightened period of time ; and having great reason, from what passes within my own observation, to believe these accounts too true, I have often heaved the involuntary sigh in secret, that so sordid should be the fate of many thousands of my countrymen.

But never did I imagine that the public mind could be so very much debased, so totally lost to every sense of knowledge, as I find it is supposed to be, by the author of a publication within a few days past ushered to our acquaintance, entitled, "*Ten Minutes Caution from a plain Man to his fellow Citizens*," as that it could possibly be imposed on by the flimsy, ridiculous arguments he
there

there pretends to hold forth, by way of dissuading his readers from certain proceedings, which he alludes to in a very strange manner, and to poison their minds against the *whole* works of Mr. Paine, by a wilful misunderstanding and false statement of a *part* of them.

Before I proceed any further, I think it necessary to declare, and I hereby solemnly protest, that I disclaim altogether Mr. Paine's doctrine of our having "no Constitution," because I am convinced that we have one, which, in its *original* state, comes as near to perfection as the efforts of human creatures can make any thing. Nay, I confess I am of opinion with an author I have lately read on the subject, somewhat enthusiastic perhaps, "that if ever the Almighty could be "supposed to have interfered particularly in any "human institution, it must certainly be in that "of the original construction of the British Constitution." At the same time, I confess myself much indebted to Mr. Paine for his denial of its existence, as that first put me in the mind of setting about to convince myself of the truth, or otherwise, of his assertion; and I have, by so doing, obtained the satisfactory conviction, which I here profess. I wish, with all my heart, that every man in the kingdom would do the same, and particularly, "a plain Man," who would, in that case, cease to trouble the world with his "*ten Minutes Caution*," till he knew some little more of the subject on which he treats.

Having premised thus much, and that my line
of

of life, being a tradesman, places me, without any predilection for "levelling principles, or doctrines," on a *level* with this author---I will now proceed to the notice of what our "plain Man" assures us are the first fruits of his pen; the primitive political effusions of his trade-worn brain, issuing from the comfortable and enviable retreat, "his little snug parlour."

I agree with him, "that in general it is of very little importance to the reader to know *who*, or *what* sort of person the writer of any thing is;" but as this worthy tradesman has chosen voluntarily to describe to us what *he is not*, and what *he is*, we are fairly entitled to the allowance of believing, or dissenting from, the truth of the character, by a candid comparison of the several *features* of the *picture*, with what he holds forth as the *original*. Passing over what he terms his *non-entity*, let us take a view of what he affirms he *really is*. "I am (says he) a plain man, a tradesman, who having acquired a competency by his honest industry, is now winding up his business, in order to enjoy that competency in ease and quiet in his old age, in the midst of a virtuous family of his own rearing."

The facility with which this "plain Man" passes from the *first* person to the *third*, in the above six lines, proves clearly, that though it is so long since he left the "Charter-House, he remembers *a little of his grammar*, as well as Mr. Paine." I give him credit also for "his honest industry and his competency," but I cannot believe

believe he has any "family," for the following reason. Every man who has a family, and has had "a Charter-House education," must be supposed to know that the English Constitution has vested in all its sons certain inestimable rights, privileges and immunities, which have hitherto, at least till the American and French revolutions, made him the envy of the whole world; and that it is the peculiar duty of every man, to transmit these rights to his posterity, as free and unimpaired as possible; and not merely content himself with the convenient and sensual enjoyments of good eating, washed down by grateful potations of London porter, and the luxurious and fascinating fumes of James' river tobacco. If he had a family he would look farther than such enjoyments. I rather take it he is some sturdy bachelor, who having amassed or saved his competency, is willing to enjoy it totally undisturbed by any *present measures* which may be adopted for the accomplishment of any *future end*; no matter how salutary to posterity, let posterity, for him, take care of themselves. I rather suspect he is one of that class of men whom I have once heard described by a foreigner, in a play---where he says,

"——Give but an Englishman his whore and ease,
"Beef and a sea-coal fire he's yours for ever."——

Such an one, if I may judge by his sentiments, which I call *features*, comes nearer to the likeness of this "plain Man," than his own description of being "in the midst of a virtuous family
"of his own rearing."

He

He next tells us, that he is wonderfully anxious for the “happiness or unhappiness of his fellow citizens;” and wishes “to caution his countrymen against the mischief some men and some writers would wish to do among them.” Consider (says he) my friends, at what time, and in what circumstances, those men would persuade us to make a change in our situation. Would any of us think it prudent, in the way of our trade, if our business were good, our shop well frequented, our customers increasing, in short every thing about us in a thriving condition, all at once to alter our *firm*, to change our agents abroad, to dismiss our clerks and servants at home; and to tell our customers that we were to deal in a quite different way with them for the future? Would any of us do this? or would not our relations take out a commission of lunacy against us if we did?”

If this “plain Man” in asking the above questions means to confine them *literally* and *actually* to our shops and our trade, I readily answer No; and agree to the madness and absurdity of such a conduct; but if he intends thereby to reason hypothetically, and to compare “our shops, our trade, customers, agents abroad, and clerks and servants at home,” to our Constitution, and that part of it particularly which it has lately been contended by many writers wants a reform, namely, our House of Commons; I shall beg leave to answer him by asking
a

a similar question, and leave him and my readers at large to make the answer.

What would this "plain Man," or any other, think of a master tradesman who left his business to the management of his servants for *seven years* together, without looking at their work, or examining their accounts; and the manner in which they dispose of his property? But if he knew too, that his servants were paid by another to do his work badly, would he not be sure that such a tradesman would break?—this is my question, which I leave to others to answer for themselves. On my own part, I say, that members of parliament are our servants, and used formerly to receive wages from us; but our negligence in permitting them to keep their places too long, has enabled them (the present parliament excepted) to get more by working for themselves; and being paid like post boys (except as before excepted) not by their proper masters, but by those whom they carry, they have sweated and flogged us as unmercifully for a place or a pension, as the others do their master's horses, for half-a-crown extraordinary.

I agree with this "plain Man" that in this country "there is no exclusion of men from public situations of the highest rank and consequence, on account of inferiority of birth, or of family." I have heard a "shoe black has been a member of the House of Commons, and got a title before now;" therefore I cannot be surprized that a fellow 'prentice of this
"plain

“ plain man is now a member of parliament, and
 “ very much respected in the House of Com-
 “ mons.” Neither do I wonder that this “ plain
 “ Man would not change situations with him.”
 What is the House of Commons compared to
 his “ little snug parlour ?” Besides his fellow
 ‘prentice may perhaps be infinitely more respected
 in the House of Commons, than he is *out of it* ;
 and if so, our “ plain Man” has the whip hand
 of him all to nothing.

“ I should be glad to know, says this ‘ plain
 “ Man,’ what advantage we are to get by the le-
 “ velling of ranks, which those writers would
 “ persuade us to wish for by regaining what they
 “ call the *Rights of Man*.”

This “ plain Man” is an admirable bush
 fighter, for he has always around him a number
 of enemies which nobody else can see. He has
 been talking of “ those writers” for six pages,
 and goes on in the same way for many more,
 without mentioning *one by name*. This puts me
 in mind of a man, who went to a Justice of Peace
 to get a warrant against several persons who, he
 said, had committed an assault on him : and on
 being asked their names, he replied, “ John
 “ Thompson and a parcel of them ;” so we find
 “ those writers” to be a “ plain Man’s parcel of
 “ them ;” and “ John Thompson, to be Mr.
 “ Paine :” of whom more anon.

We will quit them for the present, and at-
 tend to this “ plain Man and his wealthy custo-
 “ mers” who, he says “ put a great deal of money
 “ in his pocket in the year, whose expences, suit-

“able to their rank and station in life, enable him
 “to enjoy all the solid comforts suitable to *his*.”
 —Well said!—“to’t, Luxry pell mell.” “Let
 “those who like it go back to the woods again,
 “and live as they say men lived in this country,
 “two thousand years ago; I will rather keep as
 “I am, says our plain Man, the solid comforts
 “of life, and my little snug parlour for me.”
 He cares not whether the wealth of his customers springs from jobs, contracts, lottery tickets, or any other political bonusses; they all add to his competence, and the comforts of his retreat, which rather than have disturbed, he would see the liberties of all mankind chained to the pump at *Aldgate*. I will leave this “plain Man” to settle his accounts in the best manner he may with his Manchester correspondent; it seems to me from the articles *they* deal in with each other, they can only be considered as *haberdashers of small wares*. I will also assure him, that I would much rather trust to “Lords and Dukes, than
 “to either him or his *opposite neighbour* to be-
 “come *Judges*,” did I think a reform would render it necessary that we must have *one or the other of them*, in that capacity; but I flatter myself, that salutary event may take place, without our being reduced to so deplorable an alternative.

Little credit does his allusion to the burning the cotton mills at Manchester add to his argument, unless he could prove that some of “those
 “writers” (his friends in the moon) were the advisers and promoters of these conflagrations; they call the public mind back to the recollection
 of

of the Birmingham blaze, and set afloat again the damning suspicion, which certain people, who may perhaps be friends to a "plain Man's wealthy customers," would wish to be buried in oblivion. Let him ponder on this before he writes again, or those customers may leave his shop. If they should, "a new system may indeed take place, which, as he says p. 11. may put his industrious shopmen out of employ."

"We hear a great deal (says our plain Man, p. 11) about the *Americans*, and the *French*, and the excellent Governments they have established;" and in p. 13, "I do not imagine any of my countrymen know what these American or French constitutions are." His countrymen are very much obliged to him for this compliment to their ignorance; but he will find that he is mistaken, and that many thousands of his countrymen are perfectly convinced both these constitutions are as superior to the *present state* of ours, as ours was once superior to all the constitutions in the world besides. This "plain Man" says he is told "that in fact the French have no Constitution, or Government, at all." If he will spare so much from his competence, as will purchase the two tracts which contain the history of these Constitutions, he may thereby inform himself; unless the clouded habits of his "little snug parlour" should have too much muddled his intellect: should that be the case, I would advise his housekeeper to get him "an apothecary and physician, to have him physicked, blooded and blistered, and when, like his neighbour (men-

tioned

“tioned in p. 15) he has been brought through
 “agonies and convulsions to the brink of the
 “grave,” he may possibly find himself so restored,
 that “*those writers*” he talks of, will not be able
 to impose on his purified faculties, even “by puz-
 “zling him with hard words.”

At last, in the 15th page, we are come to a
 writer by name, and Mr. Paine is the man. I
 have already disclaimed every idea of adherence to
 Mr. Paine's doctrine as to our constitution, being
 a *nonentity*, and I now repeat it; but, I am not
 so ungrateful as to refuse him my acknowledg-
 ments for many passages in his “RIGHTS OF
 “MAN,” for which I think, not myself only,
 but the public in general, are very highly in-
 debted to him; and in doing this, I also thank
 this “plain Man,” for affording me so apt an
 opportunity.

“Mr. Paine (he says) is always endeavour-
 “ing to impose upon us by the *economy* of his
 “plans. He tells us we are oppressed and ruined
 “by taxes.” Alas! we wanted not Mr. Paine
 to tell us this---we felt it but too sensibly before
 his information; but we are obliged to him for
 any hints which may tend to alleviate them.
 “Our taxes (continues this ‘plain Man’ p. 16)
 “are certainly heavy, and I am glad to find our
 “present managers have begun to take off some
 “of them.” Yes they have begun, but who may
 we thank for it? Mr. Paine, and the Russian
 armament. The latter rendered some such mea-
 sure necessary---the former pointed out how it was
 to be effected. If there be an unprejudiced person

in the kingdom, who has read Mr. P—'s book, and continues blind to this, in that state let him continue for me---I think him unworthy the blessings of vision.

“ But (says this ‘plain Man’) I don’t find “ we have been ruined by these taxes ; on the “ contrary, we have been thriving apace, though “ our debts, and necessary public expences oblige “ us to pay what we do at present.” This man who has got a competence, and wishes to enjoy it in “ his little snug parlour,” may have been, and may now be thriving ; but what say the labouring part of the community on this head ?--- But he writes, “ our debts and *necessary* public “ expences.” Let us advert to what Mr. Paine says on this subject, and with him take a review of the taxation in England.

“ It is now, says Mr. Paine, 700 years since “ the Norman conquest, and the establishment of “ what is called the Crown. Taking this portion “ of time in seven separate periods, of one hundred years each, the amount of the annual “ taxes, at each period, will be as follows :

“ Annual amount of taxes levied by William the } £.
Conqueror, beginning in the year 1066, } 400,000

“ Annual amount of taxes at one hundred years }
from the conquest (1166) } 200,000

“ Annual amount of taxes at 200 years from the }
conquest (1266) } 150,000

“ Annual amount of taxes at 300 years from the }
conquest (1366) } 130,000

“ Annual amount of taxes, at 400 years from the }
conquest (1466) } 100,000

“ These

“ These statements, and those which follow,
 “ are taken from Sir John Sinclair’s History of
 “ the Revenue ; by which it appears, that taxes
 “ continued decreasing for four hundred years.
 “ The people of England, of the present day, have
 “ a traditionary and historical idea of the bravery
 “ their ancestors ; but whatever their virtues or
 “ their vices might have been, they certainly were
 “ a people who would not be imposed upon, and
 “ who kept Government in awe as to taxation,
 “ if not as to principle.

“ Let us now review the remaining 300 years,

“ Annual amount of taxes, at 500 years from the conquest (1566)	£. 500,000
---	---------------

“ Annual do. at 600 yrs from the conquest (1666)	1,800,000
--	-----------

“ Annual amount of do. at the present time 1791,	17,000,000
--	------------

“ The difference between the first four hun-
 “ dred years, and the last three, is so astonishing
 “ as to warrant an opinion that the National cha-
 “ racter of the English has changed. It would
 “ have been impossible to have dragooned the
 “ former English into the excess of taxation that
 “ now exists ; and when it is considered that the
 “ pay of the army, the navy, and of all the re-
 “ venue officers, is the same now as it was a hun-
 “ dred years ago, when the taxes were not above
 “ a tenth part of what they are at present, it ap-
 “ pears impossible to account for the enormous
 “ encrease and expenditure on any other ground
 “ than extravagance, corruption and intrigue.”

“ This ‘ plain Man’ says, Mr. Paine does not
 “ attempt to prove that the servants he proposes
 “ would

“ would be sufficient to do the business, but only
 “ has made the discovery that if you had fewer
 “ servants, at less wages, it would cost you less.”
 Whereas Mr. Paine says, page 120, 2d part of his
 book, “ To shew that five hundred thousand
 “ pounds is more than sufficient to defray all the
 “ expences of Government, exclusive of navies
 “ and armies, the following estimate is added, for
 “ *any* country of the same extent as England.”
 Then follows the estimate, p. 121, which includes
 an “ allowance of 500l. a year each to 300 Re-
 “ presentatives ; and the whole amounts to
 “ 497,500l. He then adds, that the foregoing
 “ is not offered as an exact detail of offices, but
 “ to shew the number and rate of salaries which
 “ 500,000l. will support ; and it will, on expe-
 “ rience, be found impracticable to find business
 “ sufficient to justify even this expence.”---How
 does this agree with a “ plain Man’s” assertion ?

In page 130, Mr. Paine says, “ reckoning
 “ the taxes by families, five to a family, in Eng-
 “ land, each family pays on an average 12l. 17s. 6d.
 “ per annum ; to this sum are to be added the
 “ poor rates. Though all pay taxes in the arti-
 “ cles they consume, all do not pay poor-rates.
 “ About two millions are exempted, some as not
 “ being housekeepers, others as not being able,
 “ and the Poor themselves who receive the relief.
 “ The average, therefore, of poor rates, on the
 “ remaining number, is forty shillings on every
 “ family of five persons, which makes the whole
 “ average amount of taxes and rates, 14l. 17s. 6d.
 “ For six persons, 17l. 17s. For seven persons,
 “ 20l. 6s. 6d. “ The

“ The average taxes in America, under the
 “ new or representative system of Government,
 “ including the interest of the debt contracted in
 “ the war, and taking the population at four mil-
 “ lions of souls, which it now amounts to (and
 “ it is daily increasing) is five shillings per head,
 “ men, women and children. The difference,
 “ therefore, between the two Governments is as
 “ under :

	<i>England.</i>	<i>America.</i>
“ For a family of five persons	£14 17 6	£1 5 0
“ For a family of six persons	17 17 0	1 10 0
“ For a family of seven persons	20 16 6	1 15 0

So much for taxes, under which a “ plain Man”
 thrives so well in his “ snug parlour.”

“ Mr. Paine, says this ‘ plain Man,’ is a great
 “ pretender to humanity, and therefore gives us
 “ a fine plan for providing for the poor and the
 “ aged. But Mr. P—’s plan would set them all
 “ idle at once, and so make us pay for that
 “ wretchedness and vice, which would be the
 “ sure effects of their idleness; and after all,
 “ make the condition of the poor themselves worse
 “ than it ever was before.”

For a refutation of this assertion, which is as
 false, as it is scandalous and impudent, I refer my
 readers to the plan itself, which will clearly shew
 that it would prevent there being any poor what-
 ever in a state of idleness---I shall just give his
 enumeration of the particulars, as follows :

- “ First, Abolition of two Millions of Poor Rates.
- “ Secondly, Provision for 250,000 Poor Families.
- “ Thirdly, Education for 130,000 Children.
- “ Fourthly, Comfortable Provision for 140,000 aged Persons.
- “ Fifthly, Donation of 20s. each for 50,000 Births.
- “ Sixthly,

“ By the operation of this plan (says Mr.
 “ Paine) the Poor Laws, those instruments of
 “ civil torture, will be superseded, and the waste-
 “ ful expence of litigation prevented. The hearts
 “ of the humane will not be shocked by ragged
 “ and hungry children, and persons of seventy
 “ and eighty years of age begging for bread. The
 “ dying poor will not be dragged from place to
 “ place, to breathe their last, as a reprisal of pa-
 “ rish upon parish. Widows will have a main-
 “ tenance for their children, and not be carted
 “ away on the death of their husbands, like cul-
 “ prits and criminals ; and children will no longer
 “ be considered as increasing the distresses of their
 “ parents. The haunts of the wretched will be
 “ known, because it will be to their advantage,
 “ and the number of petty crimes, the offspring
 “ of distress and poverty, will be lessened. The
 “ poor as well as the rich, will then be interested
 “ in the support of Government, and the cause
 “ and apprehension of riots and tumults will
 “ cease. Ye who sit in ease, and solace yourselves
 “ in plenty, and such there are in Turkey and
 “ Russia, as well as in England, and who say to
 “ yourselves, ‘ Are we not well off,’ have ye
 “ thought on these things ? When ye do, ye
 “ will cease to speak and feel for yourselves alone.”

Let the “ plain Man,” with “ his compe-
 “ tence in his little snug parlour,” attend to the
 above. Let him point out what part of the plan

would "make the condition of the poor themselves worse than it was before." Let him blush, if he can, and beg pardon of his fellow-citizens, for the barefaced and impudent falsehood he has dared to advance, in order to mislead and impose on them ; and let him resolve, as a small expiation, that as this is the first time he has taken up his pen for so black and infamous a purpose, it shall also be the last.

I now come to the conclusion of this "plain Man." This caution-monger, after the falsehoods he has advanced, and which I think I have fully exposed and detected---who confesses that his work has neither Philosophy nor fine writing to recommend it---continues, "I may venture to beseech you, not to throw away all the blessings you possess, on a wild experiment to find something better, and that too on the authority of people who have an interest in misleading you." This man to talk of the attempts of others to mislead ! It is highly laughable to think of it. "For my own part (he continues) I am come to an age that cannot look for living long to enjoy our present national prosperity"---'tis almost a pity he should---"but I have children and grand-children ; and I cannot bear to think that folly or wickedness should endanger the happiness which I hope they will inherit by having the good fortune to be born under the British Constitution."

Thus

Thus finishes the "Plain Man's Ten Minutes Caution," with a high compliment to the *British Constitution*, without one single word of argument to prove the excellence of which he boasts, or deigning to give a shadow of a reason more than his own *immaculate ipse dixit*, why his fellow citizens should avoid listening to any arguments tending to a Reform of Parliament, to which his whole great and mighty caution alludes, and is meant to guard them against.

But I shall not suffer the subject to be thus traduced, and go off in this manner. I have mentioned the Constitution of Great-Britain with enthusiasm. I still profess the same opinion of its original formation, and still, *nay for that very reason*, I contend that a Reform in Parliament is absolutely necessary to its existence and preservation.

On glancing my eye once more over the pages of this "plain Man's Caution," I see a few words which escaped me before, and which serve very well to be noticed in this place.

"Just as madly, my friends (says he p. 4) "it appears to me should we act, if in the present "situation of our public affairs, we should think "of altering that Constitution under which, by "the blessing of God, we have attained and enjoyed "our present national security and prosperity."

Who is it that wishes "to *alter* the Constitution?" Not those who contend for a Reform

form in Parliament. No; they only desire to restore it to its primitive force and vigour. Beautiful as I allow it originally was, time and other circumstances have operated so forcibly upon it, that its real friends and well-wishers perceive the shock it has received, and are willing, by the application of a mild and constitutional regimen, to "infuse a new portion of health into it;" to renovate its strength, so greatly exhausted and impaired; to give it back those grand sources of existence which shall henceforward prevent it from suffering a similar decay.

They view with great concern the blow it received from the Statute of disfranchisement passed in the 8th year of Henry VI. and the more deadly one in that of the Triennial Bill, 6th of William and Mary, which attempted to give the first legal sanction to the continuance of the same parliament beyond the sitting of a single session---thereby converting an institution which was intended by our forefathers to be the people's defence against aristocratic domination, or regal despotism---into an engine, in the hands of a Minister, to tax, oppress, insult and enslave the people of this country.

Who then can reflect without horror on the vital stab aimed at it by the Septennial Act; whereby a parliament, one branch of which was only chosen for *three* years, assumed the power of acting for *seven*; and thus, in a manner, annihilated

nihilated the Representation of the Commons of England. And what is still more dreadful, the precedent stares us in the face, with this bitter reflection, that a future parliament, with just as good and lawful authority as the former had, may vote itself *perpetual*, and then, adieu to the Liberties of Englishmen for ever !

And pray, let me ask, what security have we that this may not be the case in a very few years ? Let us remember that what *has* been, not only *may*, but is *likely* to be again. Let us call to mind, that since the Revolution, a period of little more than a century, four arbitrary and unjust alterations have taken place in our Constitution. First, the Triennial Act, by which the right of election was taken from us, by extending the duration of parliament from one to three years ; then, in the reign of Geo. I. the parliament, chosen only for three years, repealed this triennial law, and made another commonly called the Septennial Law ; by which they gave themselves a duration for seven years, without the slightest authority from, or even consulting their constituents. In the reign of George II. they made a conditional law, which might have given them a duration for twelve years. And notwithstanding this law never took place, yet it is a fourth precedent in the English history, and the third since the Revolution, wherein the House of Commons hath thought proper to restrain the elective power of the people by act of parlia-

parliament---those very people from whom they derive their right to do any thing in their capacity of legislators. To which we may add, the qualifying law (which makes a fourth precedent since the Revolution) whereby the elective power of the people, is directed to the object they shall choose, which is now confined to the rich in land.

Thus, the House of Commons, from being deputies in a State, formed upon the common rights of mankind, are now become principals, and controul the creative power from whence they derive their authority; which is acting upon the very same principle by which the ancient Romans lost their liberty; when the Consuls, who were in their Constitution annually elective, continued themselves in power, by their own authority, and consequently made the people slaves. The downfall of the empire followed soon after, and was effected by those very warlike people from whom sprung the Saxons, who laid the foundation of our own glorious constitution. This constitution is founded upon the common rights of mankind, in which wisdom and honesty were the only qualifications necessary for a member of parliament, and so continued down for twelve hundred years. Four violent *alterations*, each tending more than the other to the injury of the people's rights and privileges, vested in them by it, have taken place in one century, without the authority of the people, and against their consent. When

we

we now ask for a restoration of *one* of those rights, a more equal Representation, of which we have been unjustly deprived, we are haughtily told there is danger in the attempt---that it would be an innovation, and that our Constitution is too valuable and sacred to be meddled with in the least.---What! my countrymen! shall we tamely submit to be thus imposed upon? Shall we look on and see *repeated* alterations made in it to our *injury*, and be persuaded that it will not bear *one* for our *good*---though this *one* is no new experiment, but only to place it in the same situation in which it stood unshaken for twelve hundred years, the wonder and admiration of surrounding nations? Perish the thought!—Let me admonish you, my countrymen, to take care in time. In less than twenty-one years, the parliament made itself from annual to septennial---and they have the same right to vote themselves perpetual. We have no security that the next Parliament to this may not do so, *save one*, and that is our own unanimity, and determined resolution, never to cease, by associations and every other peaceable, legal and constitutional means in our power, to obtain that Barrier which alone can save us from the fangs of Despotism, namely, *annual Parliaments, and an equal Representation therein*. Nothing short of this can possibly save us. It is no *alteration*, no *innovation*. It is nothing more than bare *restoration* of our *ancient*, our *admirable*,
and

and *glorious* CONSTITUTION.—Remember this; O Britons! and let past experience root indelibly in your hearts and minds, this true and memorable maxim—

“WHERE ANNUAL ELECTION ENDS, SLAVERY BEGINS.”

F I N I S.

